ICM 2002 · Vol. III · 1–3

arXiv:math/0304266v1 [math.DG] 18 Apr 2003

Some Applications of Collapsing with Bounded Curvature

Anton Petrunin*

Abstract

In my talk I will discuss the following results which were obtained in joint work with Wilderich Tuschmann.

1. For any given numbers m, C and D, the class of m-dimensional simply connected closed smooth manifolds with finite second homotopy groups which admit a Riemannian metric with sectional curvature $|K| \leq C$ and diameter $\leq D$ contains only finitely many diffeomorphism types.

2. Given any m and any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive constant $i_0 = i_0(m, \delta) > 0$ such that the injectivity radius of any simply connected compact m-dimensional Riemannian manifold with finite second homotopy group and Ricci curvature $Ric \geq \delta$, $K \leq 1$, is bounded from below by $i_0(m, \delta)$.

I also intend to discuss Riemannian megafolds, a generalized notion of Riemannian manifolds, and their use and usefulness in the proof of these results.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 53C.

This note is about a couple of applications and variations of techniques developed in [CFG], which we found jointly with W. Tuschmann. Namely I will talk about injectivity radius estimates for positive pinching, a generalized notion of manifolds, and finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds with bounded curvature. The purpose of this note is to give an informal explanation of ideas in these proofs and for more details I refer the reader to [PT].

1. Injectivity radius estimates and megafolds

Is it true that positive pinching of the sectional curvatures of a simply connected manifold implies some lower positive bound for the injectivity radius, which does not depend on the manifold? For dimension = 3 this was proved by Burago and Toponogov [BT]. More generally, they proved the following:

*Department of Mathematics, PSU, University Park, PA 16802, USA. E-mail: petrunin@math.psu.edu

Theorem A. *Given any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive constant $i_0 = i_0(\delta) > 0$ such that the injectivity radius of any simply connected compact 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold with Ricc$\geq \delta$, $K \leq 1$, is bounded from below by i_0.*

Moreover they made a conjecture that this result should be also true for higher dimensions. Later on some new examples of manifolds with positively pinched curvature were found by Alloff and Wallach, Eschenburg and Bazaikin ([AW], [E], [B]) which disprove this conjecture in general, but since then closely related conjectures appeared on almost each list of open problems in Riemannian geometry. The theorem which we proved can be formulated as follows:

Theorem B. *Given any m and any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive constant $i_0 = i_0(m, \delta) > 0$ such that the injectivity radius of any simply connected compact m-dimensional Riemannian manifold with finite second homotopy group and Ricc$\geq \delta$, $K \leq 1$, is bounded from below by $i_0(m, \delta)$.*

Theorem B generalizes the Burago-Toponogov Theorem A to arbitrary dimensions and is also in even dimensions interesting, since there is no Synge theorem for positive Ricci curvature. For sectional curvature pinching a similar result was obtained independently by Fang and Rong [FR].

Now I will turn to one proof of this statement which is described in the appendix of [PT] (The main part of paper contains an other proof). This proof makes use of a generalized notion of Riemannian manifold, which was also described by Gromov in the end of section 8_+ of [G3], and employs a "tangential" version of Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. Here I will just give an informal analogy which describes this notion. The formal aspects and all further details can be found in [PT].

One may think about a manifold as a set of charts and glueing mappings. For a Riemannian manifold, denoting the disjoint union of all charts with the pulled back metrics by (U, g), the set of all glueing maps defines an isometric pseudo-group action by a pseudogroup G on (U, g). Here is the definition of a pseudogroup action:

Definition. *A pseudogroup action (or pseudogroup of transformations) on a manifold M is given by a set G of pairs of the form $p = (D_p, \bar{p})$, where D_p is an open subset of M and $\bar{p}$ is a homeomorphism $D_p \to M$, so that the following properties hold:*

(1) $p, q \in G$ implies $p \circ q = (\bar{q}^{-1}(D_p \cap \bar{q}(D_p)), \bar{p} \circ \bar{q}) \in G$;

(2) $p \in G$ implies $p^{-1} = (\bar{p}(D_p), \bar{p}^{-1}) \in G$;

(3) $(M, id) \in G$;

(4) if $\bar{p}$ is a homeomorphism from an open set $D \subset M$ into M and $D = \bigcup_\alpha D_\alpha$, where D_α are open sets in M, then the property $(D, \bar{p}) \in G$ is equivalent to $(D_\alpha, \bar{p}|_{D_\alpha}) \in G$ for any α.

We call the pseudo-group action natural *if in addition the following is true:*

(i)′ If $(D, \bar{p}) \in G$ and $\bar{p}$ can be extended as a continuous map to a boundary point $x \in \partial D$, then there is an element $(D', \bar{p}') \in G$ such that $x \in D'$, $D \subset D'$ and $\bar{p}'|_D = \bar{p}$.

To form a manifold this action must be in addition properly discontinuous

and free. If it just properly discontinuous then we obtain an orbifold. In the case of a general (isometric!) pseudogroup action we obtain a *it Riemannian megafold* (cf. [PT]). The megafold which is obtained this way will be denoted by $(\mathcal{M}, g) = ((U, g) : G)$.

Now we come to the main notion of this section:

Definition. *A sequence of Riemannian megafolds $(\mathcal{M}_n, g_n)$ is said to Grothendieck-Lipschitz converge (GL-converge) to a Riemannian megafold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ if there are representations $(\mathcal{M}_n, g_n) = ((U_n, g_n) : G_n)$ and $(\mathcal{M}, g) = ((U, g) : G)$ such that*

(a) The (U_n, g_n) Lipschitz converge to (U, g), and

(b) For some sequence $\epsilon_n \to 0$ there is a sequence of $e^{\pm\epsilon_n}$-bi-Lipschitz homeomorphisms $h_n : (U_n, g_n) \to (U, g)$ such that the pseudogroup actions on $\{(U_n, g_n)\}$ converge (with respect to the homeomorphisms h_n) to a pseudogroup action on $\{(U, g)\}$.

I.e., for any converging sequence of elements $p_{n_k} \in G_{n_k}(U_{n_k}, \mathcal{M}_{n_k})$ there exists a sequence $p_n \in G_n$ which converges to the same local isometry on U, and the pseudogroup of all such limits, acting on U, coincides with the pseudogroup action $G(U, \mathcal{M})$.

Here are two simple examples of GL-convergence:

Consider the sequence of Riemannian manifolds $S^1_\epsilon \times \mathbb{R}$, which for $\epsilon \to 0$ Gromov-Hausdorff converge to $\mathbb{R}$. Then this sequence converges in the GL-topology to a Riemannian megafold $\mathcal{M}$, which can described as follows: It is covered by one single chart $U = \mathbb{R}^2$, and the pseudogroup G simply consists of all vertical shifts of $\mathbb{R}^2$. I.e., $\mathcal{M}$ is nothing but $(\mathbb{R}^2 : \mathbb{R})$ where $\mathbb{R}$ acts by parallel translations. (Note that $(\mathbb{R}^2 : \mathbb{R}) \neq \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{R}$, these megafolds even have different dimensions!)

The Berger spheres, as they Gromov-Hausdorff collapse to S^2, converge in Grothendieck-Lipschitz topology to the Riemannian megafold $(S^2 \times \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{R})$. Here $\mathbb{R}$ acts by parallel shifts of $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$.

Notice that a Riemannian metric on a megafold $((U, g) : G)$ defines a pseudometric on the set of G orbits. In particular one has that the diameter of a Riemannian megafold is well defined. Now here is the basic result, whose proof is obvious from the definitions:

Theorem C. *The set of Riemannian m-manifolds (megafolds) with bounded sectional curvature $|K| \leq 1$ and diameter $\leq D$ is precompact (compact) in the Grothendieck-Lipschitz topology.*

Now let us state some natural questions which arise from this theorem:

1. Which Riemannian megafolds can be approximated by manifolds with bounded curvature and diameter?

Note that the infinitesimal motions of the pseudogroup G give rise to a Lie algebra of Killing fields on a megafold (U, g) from which one can recover an isometric local action of a connected Lie group on (U, g). Let us call this group G_o. Then G_o is obviously an invariant of the megafold, i.e., does not depend on a particular representation $(U : G)$. It follows now from [CFG] that if $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ is a limit of

Riemannian manifolds with bounded curvature, then $G_o(\mathcal{M})$ must be nilpotent. A direct construction moreover shows that this condition is also sufficent.

(Note that since a pure N-structure on a simply connected manifold is given by a torus action, one also has the following: If a megafold can be approximated by simply connected manifolds with bounded curvature, then $G_o(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{R}^k$.)

2. How can one recover the Gromov-Hausdorff limit space from a Grothendieck-Lipschitz limit?

Let $\mathcal{M} = ((U, g) : G)$ be a GL-limit of Riemannian manifolds. The GH-limit is the space of G orbits with the induced metric, in other words: The Gromov-Hausdorff limit is nothing but $(U, g)/G$.

Riemannian megafolds are actually not that general objects as they might seem at first sight. Indeed, given a Riemannian megafold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ we can consider its orthonormal frame bundle $(F\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$, equipped with the induced metric. Now consider some representation of it, say, $(F\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) = ((U, \tilde{g}) : G)$. Then the G pseudogroup action is free on U, so that its closure $\bar{G}$ also acts freely. Therefore the corresponding factor, equipped with the induced metric, is a Riemannian manifold $Y = (U/\bar{G}, \bar{g})$, and there is a Riemannian submersion $(F\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) \to (U/\bar{G}, \bar{g})$ whose fibre is G_o/Γ_o, where Γ_o is a dense subgroup of G_o (Roughly speaking, Γ_o is generated by the intersections of G_o and G). If we assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is simply connected, then $G_o = \mathbb{R}^k$ and Γ_o is the homotopy sequence image of $\pi_2(Y)$. In particular, the dimension of the free part of $\pi_2(Y)$ is at least $k + 1$.

Notice that for Riemannian megafolds one can define the de Rham complex just as well as for manifolds. (In fact I am not aware of a single notion or theorem in Riemannian geometry which does not admit a straightforward generalization to Riemannian megafolds!) From the above characterization of Riemannian megafolds it is not hard to obtain the following:

Theorem D. *Let M_n be a sequence of compact simply connected Riemannian m-manifolds with bounded curvatures and diameters and $H^2_{dR}(M_n) = 0$ which Grothendieck-Lipschitz converges to a Riemannian megafold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$.*

Then $\mathcal{M}$ is either a Riemannian manifold and the manifolds M_n converge to $\mathcal{M}$ in the Lipschitz sense, or $H^1_{dR}(\mathcal{M}) \neq 0$.

It is in particular straightforward to show that if $\mathrm{Ricc}(\mathcal{M}) > 0$, then $H^1_{dR}(\mathcal{M}) = 0$. Moreover, a Grothendieck-Lipschitz limit of manifolds with uniformly bounded sectional curvatures and $\mathrm{Ricc} \geq \delta > 0$ is a Riemannian megafold with $\mathrm{Ricc} \geq \delta > 0$.

Now we can prove Theorem B: Assume it is wrong. Then we can find a collapsing sequence of simply connected manifolds with finite π_2 and positive Ricci-pinching, and we obtain a megafold with $H^1_{dR} \neq 0$ as a GL-limit. Applying the Bochner formula for 1-forms on this megafold, we obtain a contradiction.

2. Finiteness theorems

The following result appeared as a co-product of the theorem above, and it came as a nice surprise. Let me first formulate this finiteness results from [PT]:

Theorem E (The π_2-Finiteness Theorem). *For given m, C and D, there is only a finite number of diffeomorphism types of simply connected closed m-dimensional manifolds M with finite second homotopy groups which admit Riemannian metrics with sectional curvature $|K(M)| \leq C$ and diameter $diam(M) \leq D$.*

Theorem F (A "classification" of simply connected closed manifolds). *For given m, C and D, there exists a finite number of closed smooth simply connected manifolds E_i with finite second homotopy groups such that any simply connected closed m-dimensional manifold M admitting a Riemannian metric with sectional curvature $|K(M)| \leq C$ and diameter $diam(M) \leq D$ is diffeomorphic to a factor space $M = E_i/T^{k_i}$, where $0 \leq k_i = b_2(M) = dim\ E_i - m$ and T^{k_i} acts freely on E_i.*

Here is a short account of other finiteness results which only require volume, curvature, and diameter bounds: For manifolds M of a given fixed dimension m, the conditions

- $vol(M) \geq v > 0$, $|K(M)| \leq C$ and $\mathrm{diam}(M) \leq D$ imply finiteness of diffeomorphism types (Cheeger ([C]) 1970); this conclusion continues to hold for $vol(M) \geq v > 0$, $\int_M |R|^{m/2} \leq C$, $|\mathrm{Ric}_M| \leq C'$, $\mathrm{diam}(M) \leq D$ (Anderson and Cheeger ([AC1]) 1991);
- $vol(M) \geq v > 0$, $K(M) \geq C$ $\mathrm{diam}(M) \leq D$ imply finiteness of homeomorphism types (Grove-Petersen ([GP]) 1988, Grove-Petersen-Wu ([GPW]) 1990); Perelman, ([Pe]) 1992) (if in addition $m > 4$, these conditions imply finiteness of diffeomorphism types) and Lipschitz homeomorphism types (Perelman, unpublished);
- $K(M) \geq C$ and $\mathrm{diam}(M) \leq D$ imply a uniform bound for the total Betti number (Gromov [G1] 1981).

The π_2-Finiteness Theorem requires two-sided bounds on curvature, but no lower uniform volume bound. Thus, in spirit it is somewhere between Cheeger's Finiteness and Gromov's Betti number Theorem.

Each of the above results has (at least) two quite different proofs, the original one and one which uses Alexandrov techniques. (For Gromov's Betti number theorem we made such a proof recently, jointly with V. Kapovich and it turned out that one can even give an upper estimate for the total number of critical points of a Morse function on such a manifold, which due to the Morse inequality is a stronger condition.) Let me now explain roughly this second way of proving of such theorems:

I will take Cheeger's theorem as an example: Assume it is wrong. Then there is an infinite number of non-diffeomorphic manifolds with bounded curvature, diameter and a lower bound on the volume. Then due to Gromov's compactness theorem a subsequence of them has a limit. Then, due to the volume bound, this limit space has the same dimension, and is in fact just little worse than Riemannian; it is a manifold with a smooth structure and curvature bounded in the sense of Alexandrov. Then one only has to prove the stability result, i.e. one has to prove that starting from some big number all manifolds are diffeomorphic to the limit

space. In the case of two-sided curvature bound it is really simple, and for just lower curvature bound it is already a hard theorem of Perelman, but still it works along this lines.

Now for both of these proofs it is very important to have a uniform lower positive volume bound to prevent collapsing. In fact, if one removes this bound then it is not hard to construct infinite sequence of non-diffeomorphic manifolds. This holds for two-sided bounded as well as for lower curvature bound. And if we would try to prove it the same way as before we would get a limit space of possibly smaller dimension. Therefore the stability result can not hold this way.

This partly explains why Theorem E looks a bit surprising, we add one topological condition and get real finiteness result. The proof can go along the same lines. Take a sequence of nondiffeomorphic Riemannian manifold (M_n, g_n), by Gromov's compactness theorem we have a limit space (for some subsequence) X. The sequence must collapse, otherwise the same arguments as before would work. Since the M_n are simply connected, from [CFG] we have that collapsing takes place along some T^k-orbits of some T^k-action.

Now assume for simplicity that X is a manifold and $\pi_2(M_n) = 0$. Then all M_n are diffeomorphic to T^k bundles over X. Since the M_n are simply connected so is X. Therefore the diffeomorphism type of M_n depends only on the Euler class e_n which in this case can be interpreted as the following mapping:

$$0 = \pi_2(M_n) \to \pi_2(X) \xrightarrow{e_n} \pi_1(T^k) \to \pi_1(M_n) = 0.$$

Therefore e_n isan isomorphism between two groups and up to automorphisms of T^k all possible Euler classes e_n are the same. In particular, for large n all M_n are diffeomorphic.

That is not quite a proof since we had made quite strong assumptions on the way. But it turns out that the general case can be ruled out using a few already standard tricks from [CFG] and [GK], namely, by passing to the frame bundles FM_n and by conjugating group actions.

References

[AW] S. Aloff; N. R. Wallach, *An infinite family of* 7*-manifolds admitting positively curved Riemannian structures*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), 93–97.

[B] Ya. V. Basaikin, *On a certain family of closed* 13*-dimensional manifolds of positive curvature*, Siberian Mathematical Journal **37:6** (1996).

[BT] Y. Burago; V. A. Toponogov, *On three-dimensional Riemannian spaces with curvature bounded above*, Matematicheskie Zametki **13** (1973), 881–887.

[C] J. Cheeger, *Finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **92** (1970), 61–74.

[CFG] J. Cheeger; K. Fukaya; M. Gromov, *Nilpotent structures and invariant metrics on collapsed manifolds*, J. A.M.S **5** (1992), 327–372.

[Es] J.-H. Eschenburg, *New examples of manifolds with strictly positive curvature*, Invent. math. **66** (1982), 469–480.

[FR] F. Fang; X. Rong, *Positive Pinching, volume and second Betti number*, GAFA (Geometric and functional analysis **9** (1999).

[G1] M. Gromov, *Curvature, diameter and Betti numbers*, Comment. Math. Helv. **56** (1981), 179–195.

[G2] M. Gromov, *Stability and Pinching*, Seminare di Geometria, Giornate di Topologia e geometria delle varieta. Universita degli Studi di Bologna (1992), 55–97.

[G3] M. Gromov, *"Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian spaces"*, Birkhäuser, Basel, (1999).

[GK] K. Grove; H. Karcher, *How to conjugate C^1-close group actions*, Math. Z. **132** (1973), 11–20.

[GPW] K. Grove; P. Petersen; J. Wu, *Controlled topology in geometry*, Invent. Math. **99** (1990), 205–213; Erratum: Invent. Math. 104 (1991), 221–222.

[KS1] W. Klingenberg; T. Sakai, *Injectivity radius estimates for 1/4-pinched manifolds*, Arch. Math. **34** (1980), 371–376.

[PRT] A. Petrunin; X. Rong; W. Tuschmann, *Collapsing vs. Positive Pinching*, GAFA (Geometric and functional analysis) **9** (1999), 699–735.

[PT] A. Petrunin and W. Tuschmann, *Diffeomorphism finiteness, positive pinching, and second homotopy*, GAFA (Geometric and functional analysis) **9** (1999), 736–774.

[PT2] A. Petrunin and W. Tuschmann, *Asymptotical flatness and cone structure at infinity*, Math. Ann. **321** (2001), 775–788.